

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending in the present application. No amendments have been made herein.

Claims 1-30 are rejected. Claims 1, 10-16, and 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cochran (U.S. Patent No. 5,995,979) (“Cochran”). Claims 2-5 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cochran in view of “Compliance Solutions.” Claims 6-9 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cochran and “Compliance Solutions” in view of High, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,842,219) (“High”).

Rejection of Claims 1, 10-16, and 25-30 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 10-16, and 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cochran (U.S. Patent No. 5,995,979) (“Cochran”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In order to maintain an anticipatory rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a reference must teach every element of the claim. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). (A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.). Cochran does not qualify as an anticipatory reference with respect to claims 1, 10-16, and 25-30.

Cochran does not disclose “inputting at one of the plurality of user terminals a search request text pattern,” as recited in independent claims 1 and 16. Cochran discloses that the user selects from list identifiers, which are “terms or phrases identifying various categories of information that the user may select when formulating a search strategy.” Col. 7, lines 19-21. The user in Cochran is choosing a search from a list of various categories. In the present application, the user “inputs” a search request text pattern. By “inputting” the search request text pattern, the user is able to perform a search using any desired terms. In Cochran, however, the user is only able to choose from the categories supplied by the server. As a result, the user is

not able to enter a custom search term. Therefore, Cochran “selects” a search term, rather than “inputting” one.

Further, Cochran does not disclose a “text string further including one or more regular expression operators, including letters, digits or punctuation marks to further define the search request text pattern and to further identify the server being invoked,” as recited in independent claims 1 and 16. Cochran does not allow for further definition of the search. Although Cochran allows for selecting a number of search terms, Cochran does not disclose “regular expression operators, including letters, digits or punctuation marks” to further define the search. Further, Cochran transmits the list identifiers from the server to the user. Col. 7, lines 9-18. As a result, the user only searches the server that transmitted the list identifiers. The user in Cochran is unable to “identify the server” because only one server is being searched. Thus, Cochran has no need to identify the server. Therefore, Cochran does not disclose each and every element of claims 1 and 16 of the present application.

For at least the reasons stated above, Cochran does not anticipate independent claims 1 or 16 of the present application. Therefore, the undersigned respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 16 are allowable over the cited art. Further, dependent claims 10-16 and 25-30 are also allowable as they contain the limitations of the claims on which they depend.

Furthermore, Cochran does not disclose an “authorization code,” as recited in claims 10, 11, 25, and 26 of the present invention. On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner cites to Cochran, which states “Each search request will result in a subset of records which are then stored or marked at the server 710, in association with that identification number.” Col. 6, lines 45-47. However, the “identification number” of Cochran is not the same as the “authorization code” of claims 10, 11, 25, and 26 of the present application. Identifying a search is a different function than authorizing a user. Accordingly, Cochran does not disclose each and every element of claims 10, 11, 25, and 26.

Cochran does not disclose “matchable text pattern files are replicated between each server via the network,” as recited in claims 12 and 27. On page 3 of the Office

Action, the Examiner cites to Cochran for a disclosure of this element. However, Cochran does not disclose replicating matchable text pattern files anywhere in this citation. See col. 5, line 49 to col. 6, line 5; see also Fig. 1. The fact that Cochran uses a server and a communication link does not disclose replicating matchable text pattern files between each server. Therefore, Cochran fails to disclose each and every element of claims 12 and 27.

Cochran does not disclose “matchable text pattern files are mutually updating via the network,” as recited in claims 13 and 28 of the present application. On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner cites to Cochran, which states, “The result of the search is used to update the list of search terms that are then available for the next category.” Col. 3, lines 50-52. Updating search terms that are available in a search is not equivalent to mutually updating matchable text pattern files. Cochran does not disclose each and every element of claims 13 and 28.

Thus, the undersigned representative respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 10-16, and 25-30.

Rejection of Claims 2-5 and 17-20 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2-5 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cochran in view of “Compliance Solutions.” This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 2-5 and 17-20 are dependent upon claims 1 and 16 which are submitted to be allowable in view of Cochran for the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, claims 2-5 and 17-20 should be allowable under Cochran for these reasons as well. Further arguments are reserved with respect to dependent claims 2-5 and 17-20. Because “Compliance Solutions” does not teach or suggest the deficiencies of Cochran, claims 2-5 and 17-20 are not obvious in view of the cited references and should therefore be allowed. Therefore, the undersigned representative respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 2-5 and 17-20.

Rejection of Claims 6-9 and 21-24 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 6-9 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cochran and “Compliance Solutions” in view of High, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,842,219) (“High”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 6-9 and 21-24 are dependent upon claims 1 and 16 which are submitted to be allowable in view of Cochran for the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, claims 6-9 and 21-24 should be allowable under Cochran for these reasons as well. Further arguments are reserved with respect to dependent claims 6-9 and 21-24. Because “Compliance Solutions” and High do not teach or suggest the deficiencies of Cochran, claims 6-9 and 21-24 are not obvious in view of the cited references and should therefore be allowed.

Furthermore, neither Cochran, “Compliance Solutions,” nor High, alone or in combination, teach or suggest “comparing search nodes against characters and positions in the letter tree array,” as recited in claims 6 and 21 of the present application. High discloses “a hierarchical naming tree” for comparing complete names. See col. 5, lines 65 to col. 6, line 9. However, High does not disclose comparing search nodes against characters and positions. Cochran and “Compliance Solutions” do not cure the deficiencies of High. Therefore, the cited references do not teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, the elements of claims 6 and 21.

Moreover, the combination of Cochran and High is improper. Cochran discloses selecting terms from an identifier list. Because the terms are selected from a list, there is no chance of a misspelling, missing letters, or transposed letters. On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner suggests that it would have been obvious to modify Cochran in view of High in order to include a spelling “flag,” as recited in claims 7-9 and 22-24. However, High does not teach or suggest checking the spelling of a search term. Additionally, there is no need for Cochran to utilize a spell correct flag because all of the terms in the identifier list are presumably spelled correctly. “Compliance Solutions” does not cure the deficiencies of Cochran and High. Therefore, the combination of Cochran and High is improper.


Neither Cochran, "Compliance Solutions," nor High, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the elements of the present application. Therefore, the undersigned representative respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 6-9 and 21-24.

CONCLUSION

The undersigned believes that claims 1-30 are allowable over the cited references and respectfully requests a notice of allowance to this effect. Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below. In addition, if any additional fees are required in connection with the filing of this response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the same to Deposit Account No. 501458.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/21/05
KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
607 14th Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 508-5800

By: 
Eric L. Sophir
Registration No. 48,499